

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
10/644,394	08/19/2003	F. Frederick Pisacane		CONFIRMATION NO.
	00/17/2003		FOAMEX.031A	6128
	590 11/29/2004	EXAMINER		
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR			BALSIS, SHAY L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
IRVINE, CA 92614		-	1744	
			DATE MALLED, 11/20/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/644,394	PISACANE, F. FREDERICK
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Shay L Balsis	1744
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	ith the correspondence address
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R.1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty individuals apply and will expire SIX (6) MON thirty pages to be seen to the control of the contro	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication.
Status		ı
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15	December 2003	
	his action is non-final.	•
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allow	vance except for formal matte	ers, prosecution as to the marite is
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-48</u> is/are pending in the application	an.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdown		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	awn from consideration.	
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.		·
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) $1-48$ are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner .	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	cepted or b) objected to by	the Evaminer
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance	9 Sep 37 CED 1 95(a)
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ction is required if the drawing(s)	) is objected to See 37 CED 1 131(d)
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached (	Office Action or form PTO-152
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		- 1 <b>-2-</b>
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	n priority under 35 U.S.C. & 1	19(a)-(d) or (f)
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	, ,	(4) (4) (7).
1. Certified copies of the priority documen	its have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received in App	olication No.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price	ority documents have been re	ceived in this National Stage
application from the International Burea	iu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies not re	ceived.
•		
tachment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Sum	mary (PTO-413)
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/M	fail Date.
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5)  Notice of Infor 6) Other:	mal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Patent and Trademark Office DL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Office A	ction Summary	

Application/Control Number: 10/644,394

Art Unit: 1744

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-16, 21, 30 and 39-48, drawn to a wiper apparatus, classified in class 15, subclass 209.1.
- II. Claims 17-20 and 33-38 drawn to a method of recovering processed material, classified in class 134, subclass 6.
- III. Claims 31-32, drawn to a recovery system apparatus, classified in class 134, subclass 137.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and method of cleaning the product. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the method for cleaning the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different method of cleaning that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the wiper apparatus does not need a recovery system to be cleaned. The wiper apparatus could be cleaned by running under a water tap or by simply wiping the processed material off the apparatus with a towel or such.

Inventions I and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the invention of group I can be used without the recovery system of group II. The recovery system is not needed to make the invention of group I work. Additionally, the inventions have different

Art Unit: 1744

functions. Group I functions to remove processed material from rollers while group II functions to remove the processed material from the wiper.

Inventions II and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the method of recovering does not require a dasher or a rack while the apparatus does.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number: 10/644,394

Art Unit: 1744

## Elections of Species

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

If applicant chooses Group I above, an election of species must be made between figure 1 (claims 1-16, 39-48) and figures 8, 9 (claims 21-30).

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/644,394

Art Unit: 1744

Page 5

A telephone call was made to Gregory Hermanson on 11/23/04 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made. Applicant could not get through to attorney or the attorney's voicemail.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shay L Balsis whose telephone number is 571-272-1268. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00 M-Th, alternating F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert J. Warden can be reached on 571-272-1281. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Slb

11/23/04

ROBERT J. WARDEN, SR. SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

Polent 7. Warden Sh